Certified Validation Report

Audit Information:

Water Supplier Name:

City of Chino Hills

PWS ID: 3610036

System Type: Potable

Audit Period: Fiscal Year 2017-2018

Validation Date: 9/27/18

Utility Representation: Cheryl Yeamans, Jacob Loukeh Sufficient Supporting Documents Provided: Yes

Validation Findings & Confirmation Statement:

Key Audit Metrics:

Data Validity Score: 57 Data Validity Band (Level): Level III (51-70)

Real Loss: 0.28 (gal/conn/day)

Apparent Loss: 3.32 (gal/conn/day)

Non-revenue water as percent of cost of operating system: 0.6%

Certification Statement by Validator

California Water Code Section 10608.34. This water loss audit report has been Level 1 validated per the requirements of California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 7 and the

All recommendations on volume derivation and Data Validity Grades were incorporated into the water audit. oximes

If not, rejected recommendations are included here.

Validator Information:

Water Audit Validator: Mark Wiley

Qualifications: Certified AWWA Water Loss Validator

Certified Validation Report

Water Supplier Name: City of Chino Hills

Water Supplier ID Number: 3610036

Water Audit Period: Fiscal Year 2017-2018

Water Audit & Water Loss Improvement Steps:

water audit: Utility to provide steps taken in preceding year to increase data validity, reduce real loss and apparent loss as informed by the annual validated

of the audit period, City owned wells were taken off-line due to the new MCL for TCP. The City is now 100% reliant on purchased water from the a leaking potable storage reservoir and had it repaired. Over-age meter replacement is continuing on a 15 year cycle for all size potable meters, State, and two neighboring water agencies. A City staff member received certification in audit validation from the AWWA. with approximately 1,400 meters exchanged during the audit period. Water meters have been installed on all vehicles that use City system water (water trucks, vactors, etc.). The City hired a contractor to replace corroding saddles that will be reflected in next year's audit. For the second half The City created a GIS position and hired an employee to address inaccuracies and update mapping and technical pipeline data. City staff identified

Certification Statement by Utility Executive:

Section 10608.34 and has been prepared in accordance with the method adopted by the American Water Works Association, as contained in their This water loss audit report meets the requirements of California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 7 and the California Water Code manual, Water Audit and Loss Control Programs, Manual M36, Fourth Edition and in the Free Water Audit Software version 5.

Executive Name (Print)

Executive Position

Signature

9/27/18

Nadeem Majaj, P.E.

Director of Public Works and Engineering

#	AWWA Water Audit Input	Code	Final DVG	Basis on Input Derivation	Basis on Validity Grade
₽	Volume from Own Sources	SOA	5	Supply meter profile: Operate 4 own wells, two of which feed same meter, equating to three production meters. VOS input derived from: Manual reads from production meters as archived.	Percent of own supply metered: 100% Signal calibration frequency: N/A Volumetric testing frequency: Annual, N/A Volumetric testing method: Pitot Tube Percent of own supply tested and/or calibration
<u> </u>	Sources	VOS	U	production meters as archived. Comments: No meter test documentation, due to wells off-line. Recycled Water not included confirmed.	Percent of own supply tested and/or calibrated: 100% Comments: Wells off-line due to contamination, did not have tested during audit period.
2	VOS Master Meter & Supply Error Adjustment	VOS	ω	Input derivation: 3 Net Storage change included in MMSEA input: No Comments: No additional comments	Supply meter read frequency: Daily Supply meter read method: Manual and automatic logging. Frequency of data review for trends & anomalies: Monthly Storage levels monitored in real-time: Yes Comments: No additional comments
ω	Water Imported	<u> </u>	σ	Import meter profile: Water is imported from three agencies: WFA, CDA and MVWD. MVWD and WFA flows through two common meters maintained by MVWD. WI input derived from: Totalization of volumes per daily meter reads from importer and exporter. Comments: No supporting documentation, MVWD confirms no meter testing occurred during audit period.	Percent of import supply metered: 100% Signal calibration frequency: Annually for CDA Volumetric testing frequency: Annually for CDA Volumetric testing method: Pitot Percent of import supply testes and/or calibrated: 25% Comments: Only CDA tests and calibrates their meters, default input was used as it is a small percentage of total import.
4	WI Master Meter & Supply Error Adjustment	WI	4	Input derivation: Left blank in absence of test. Comments: No additional comments.	Imported meter read frequency: Daily Imported meter read method: Manual and automatic data logging. Frequency of data review for trends and anomalies: Monthly Comments: No additional comments
5	Water Exported	WE	n/a		
6	WE Master Meter & Supply Error Adjustment	WE MMSEA	n/a		
7	Billed Metered	BMAC	ъ	Customer meter profile: Master Meter Manufacturer Age profile: Meters range in age up to 15 years Reading System: AMR	Percent of customers metered: 100% Small meter testing policy: Reactive or flagged consumption testing only.

14	13	12	11	10	9	000	
	Systematic Data Handling Errors	Customer Metering Inaccuracies	Unauthorized Consumption	Unbilled Unmetered	Unbilled Metered	Billed Unmetered	
K	SDHA	CMI	UC	UUAC	UMAC	BUAC	
ω	5	ω	5	ω	9	n/a	
Input derivation: Total from GIS based Map. Hydrant leads included: Not Included. Comments: No additional Comments.	Comments: Default input applied.	Input derivation: Rudimentary estimate Comments: See BMAC regarding meter testing & replacement activities.	Comments: Default input applied.	Profile: Includes Fire Department usage. Comments: Custom California default of .25% used.	Profile: Includes street sweepers, vactor and water trucks, flushing. Input derivation: Direct from monthly meter reads. Comments: Input derivation from supporting documents confirmed.		Read frequency: Monthly Comments: Lag- time correction is not determined in input derivation. Input derivation from supporting documents confirmed. Exclusion of non-potable volumes confirmed.
Mapping format: Digital Asset management database: In place but separate from GIS. Map updates & field validation: Field validation does not regularly take place. Comments: The City hired a dedicated GIS staff person to address deficiencies this audit period.	Comments: Default grade applied.	Characterization of meter testing: Limited (upon request and consumption flag only). Characterization of meter replacement: Customer meters are replaced every 15 years. Comments: No additional comments.	Comments: Default grade applied.	Comments: Default grade applied.	Policy for billing exemptions: Own facilities plus other exemptions including street sweepers, vactors and water trucks. Comments: No additional comments.		Number of small meters tested/year: Not quantified but known to be small. Large meter testing policy: Reactive – complaint based or flagged consumption testing only. Number of large meters tested/year: Not quantified but known to be small. Meter replacement policy: Customer meters are replaced every 15 years. Number of replacements/year: Entire meter stock was replaced in 2004-05, replacement is cycling back. Billing data auditing: Standard billing QC, plus review of volumes by use type each billing cycle. Comments: No additional comments

		20			19				18		I			17				16				15		
	Cost	Variable Production	-		Customer Retail Unit Cost				Operating Cost	Total Annual				Pressure	Average Operating			Average Length of Cust. Service Line				Connections	Number of Service	
	13	VPC				CRUC			TAOC					AOP				Lb.			NS			
	j	7)	9			10					ω				10				9		
Comments: No additional comments.	Secondary costs included: Power	Primary costs included: Imported & treatment costs.	Supply profile: Own sources and import supply.			Comments: Customers are billed on three tiers.	Input derivation: All rate classes included.	water service and CIP included.	Comments: Confirmed costs limited to water only,	Input derivation: From official financial reports		•	Comments: No additional comments.	Input derivation: Rudimentary Estimate	Typical pressure range: 24-160 PSI	pressure zones with 53 PRV's	Number of zones, general profile: Operate four		Comments: Default input applied.	Comments: Inactive connections are included.	based.	Basis for database query: Account ID, Non- premise	system.	Input derivation: Standard report run from billing
	Comments: No additional comments.	not been reviewed by an M36 water loss expert.	Characterization of calculation: Input calculations have	Comments: No additional comments.	by the total volume of potable water delivered in CCF	derived by dividing the total volume-based revenues	Characterization of calculation: This number was	Comments: No additional comments.	Frequency of third-party CPA auditing: Annually	Frequency of internal auditing: Annually	Comments: No additional comments.	Hydraulic model: None currently in place.	Real-time monitoring limited to reservoir levels.	Characterization of real-time pressure data collection:	residents and Fire Department personnel.	test and pressures are collected at the request of	Extent of static pressure data collection: Hydrant flow		Comments: Default grade applied.	Comments: No additional comments.	Estimated error of total count within: Less than 1%	reads occur monthly.	normal meter reading process. Approximately 100 re-	CIS updates & field validation: Accomplished through

Key Audit Metrics

(#)

~ VALIDITY Data Validity Score: 57 Data Validity Band (Level): Level III (51-70)

VOLUME ILI: 0.02 Real Loss: 0.28 (gal/conn/day) Apparent Loss: 3.32 (gal/conn/day)

(\$) VALUE Annual Cost of Real Losses: \$7,494 Annual Cost of Apparent Losses: \$87,410

Infrastructure & Water Loss Management Practices:

are wrapped in plastic. Infrastructure replacement policy (current, historic): Due to corrosive soils, infrastructure is replaced with PVC, any buried metallic appurtenances Infrastructure age profile: Average infrastructure age generally falls around 30 years, and a small amount of infrastructure is 50+ years in age

Estimated main failures/year: 22 Estimated service failures/year: 45

potable reservoir was identified and repaired. Extent of proactive leakage management: The City is proactively replacing mild steel saddles with bronze saddles in problematic areas. A leaking

Other water loss management comments: Soils are highly corrosive and severely impact infrastructure

Comments on Audit Metrics & Validity Improvements

characteristics. This number is unrealistic and should be higher. The City should consider having the Monte Vista Water District calibrate and test their import meters, it seems apparent that they are under registering The infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) of .02describes a system that experiences leakage at .02 times the modeled technical minimum for its system

evaluating interventions for water and revenue loss recovery. Opportunities to improve the reliability of audit inputs and outputs include: The Data Validity Score falling within Band III (51-70) suggests that next steps may be focused simultaneously on improving data reliability and

- annually tested and calibrated. Water Imported – Since WFA and MVWD water flow through the same meters maintained by MVWD, it is encouraged to have the meters
- Customer Metering Inaccuracies The City may want to consider a customer meter testing program which tests a sample of random meters whose stratification (size, age) represents the entire meter stock.
- Billed Metered Same recommendation as Customer Metering Inaccuracies